

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 14-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 14-16, and 19 are amended. Support for the amendment to independent claims 1 and 14 can be found, at least, within claims 3 and 15. Claims 3, 4, 7, 15, 16, and 19 are amended for clarity and to remove redundant subject matter only. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-9, 11-13, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement; and rejects claims 3-9 and 15-20 as allegedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the December 7, 2005 Amendment After Final Rejection amended the claims responsive to these rejections. Additionally, by this Amendment dependent claims 7 and 19 are further amended such that Applicants respectfully submit that they meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 10, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Krishnamurthy (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,024); and rejects claims 4-9 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Krishnamurthy in view of Shabtay (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,441). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious, at least, a communication method for use in a dynamic network wherein nodes are configured to track control signaling in a routing database and use this retained information to ensure that low precedence control is not forwarded into portions of the network known to require higher precedence, as recited by independent claim 1, and similarly recited by independent claim 14.

Specifically, in rejecting this feature, the Office Action relies on col. 5, lines 13-29 of Krishnamurthy. However, this section merely discusses the collection of information describing the reserved quality of service, the participating end systems, and the path taken by the reservation system. There is no discussion within this portion or the remainder of Krishnamurthy regarding nodes configured to use retained information to ensure that low precedence control is not forwarded into portions of the network known to require higher precedence. Shabtay fails to cure the deficiencies of Krishnamurthy.

Accordingly, the applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious each and every element of independent claims 1 and 14. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 14 are patentable. The dependent claims are also patentable, at least, by virtue of their dependencies from a patentable independent claim, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Kern
Registration No. 42,719

Kevin Ross Davis
Registration No. 64,667

JSK:KRD/plj

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: August 24, 2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
